Doc. 1 Scott v. Hackett et al Case 3:06-cv-05612-FDB Document 1 Filed 10/24/2006 Page 1 of 2 1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 AT SEATTLE 8 No. MC05-5029 RICHARD ROY SCOTT. 9 10 Plaintiff. ORDER PERMITTING CASE TO PROCEED v. 11 DAVID HACKETT; and DAROLD WEEKS, 12 Defendants. 13 14 This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. On April 5, 2005, the United States 15 District Court judges who sit in Tacoma entered an order dismissing a number of plaintiff's 16 causes of action and barring future litigation unless plaintiff provides a signed affidavit, along 17 with the proposed complaint, "verifying under penalty of perjury that none of the issues raised in 18 the proposed complaint have been litigated in the past by the plaintiff." On August 31, 2006, the 19 Clerk of Court received a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, a consent for payment of costs, a 20 complaint, and a declaration signed by plaintiff. See Dkt. #90 and #91. These are now before 21 the undersigned for review pursuant to the terms of the bar order. 22 Although no relief is requested in the proposed complaint, plaintiff asserts a § 1983 claim 23 against defendant Darold Weeks and defendant David Hackett. Plaintiff alleges Mr. Weeks and 24 Mr. Hackett searched and seized plaintiff's computer in July of 2006. See Dkt. #90 (Proposed 25 Complaint) at 2. 26 **ORDER**

Pursuant to the terms of the "Order Adopting Report and Recommendation," dated April 5, 2005, plaintiff has submitted a signed declaration verifying that none of the issues raised in the proposed complaint have been litigated in the past by the plaintiff. <u>See</u> Dkt. #91 (Declaration).

The undersigned finds that the issues raised in the above-captioned matter have not been previously litigated by plaintiff and may proceed subject to the other requirements imposed by the "Order Adopting Report and Recommendation," dated April 5, 2005. The Clerk of Court shall docket this order in MC05-5029 and open a new cause of action containing all documents related to plaintiff's August 31, 2006, submission (Dkt. #90 and #91).

DATED this 23rd day of October, 2006.

Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge

MWS Casnik

ORDER -2-